

LIOCICHLA STEERII, sp. nov. (Plate XIV.)

Olivaceous green throughout; crown and occiput, chin and throat, flanks and rump smoky; patch of orange-yellow on anterior corner of eye; streaks of yellow on sides of the nape and vent-feathers, broadly tipped with orange; breast, belly, and edge of wing yellow; axillaries smoky; bill and legs light wood-brown; tail olive-green, feathers square at the ends and white, four central rectrices with a black bar before the white tips, three on each side with the apical portion of outer web black as well; secondaries washed with maroon, black on inner webs and apical half, all tipped with white, yellowish green on outer webs, stems black. Length 7·5, wing 2·7, tail 3·4.

XLII.—*A few Words on the Parrots of the Genus Eclectus*,
Wagl. By T. SALVADORI, C.M.Z.S.

IN the last number of 'The Ibis' a paper by Mr. Forbes has appeared under the title "Recent Observations on the Parrots of the Genus *Eclectus*;" and I wish to make a few remarks on it.

It seems that, although Mr. Forbes is inclined to believe Dr. Meyer's statement that the green *Eclectus* are the males, and the red ones the females, still he does not consider the fact fully established, on account of Mr. Brown's statement that it "is a *gross error*." I hope that those who are still incredulous about Meyer's discovery will know before long on which side is the *gross error*. For my part I have not the least doubt that Meyer is right. My experience is as follows:—I have examined 128 specimens of three different species of the genus *Eclectus*, collected by D'Albertis, Beccari, and Bruijn's men; and the green ones were constantly marked males, and the red ones females. Many of them were dissected by D'Albertis and Beccari. It is worth while mentioning that some of D'Albertis's birds, and all those collected by Beccari in the Aru Islands, were obtained before Meyer made his startling statement.

Mr. Forbes gives the diagnostic table published by me in 1875 (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. vii. p. 757) of the three better-known species, *E. polychlorus*, *E. grandis*, and *E. cardinalis*. He mentions that, accidentally, I have transposed in the table two names, as he has ascertained from a corrected copy of my paper that I had forwarded to Mr. Sclater. It seems that Mr. Forbes has not observed that the correction has been also properly made in the *errata* at the end of the volume in which my paper is contained; anyhow, it appears to me that, knowing my accidental mistake, he should have given my table in the right way, which is as follows:—

1. Virides: lateribus rubro-puniceis. (Mares.)
 - a. Majores.
 - a'. Viridis, colore obscuriore, cauda minus cærulea .. 1. *polychlorus*.
 - b'. Viridis, colore lætiore, cauda magis cærulea 2. *grandis*.
 - b. Minor, cauda vix cærulea 3. *cardinalis*.
2. Rubræ: fascia interscapulari et abdomine cyaneis, vel violaceis. (Feminæ.)
 - a. Annulo perioculari cyaneo 1. *polychlorus*.
 - b. Annulo perioculari cyaneo nullo.
 - a'. Subcaudalibus pure flavis 2. *grandis*.
 - b'. Subcaudalibus aureis, vel rubro-flavis 3. *cardinalis**.

In the conclusion of his paper Mr. Forbes attempts to give the sexual differences and the geographical distribution of the different species. But, according to my views, he is wrong on both points.

As regards the differences, leaving aside for the present *E. westermanni* and *E. corneliæ*, it seems that Mr. Forbes has been misled by not having attended to the correction in my table. So of *E. grandis* he says “cauda vix cærulea,” which characteristic belongs to *E. cardinalis*; and of this he says “cauda magis cærulea,” instead of “cauda vix cærulea.”

Not less important is the mistake as regards the geographical distribution. Mr. Forbes says that *E. polychlorus* “Habitat in insulis Papuanis et Moluccanis,” while in fact it is only to be found in the Papuan Islands. The three species *E. polychlorus*, *E. grandis*, and *E. cardinalis* are representative forms which inhabit each a peculiar area:

* I have altered the order of the females to match that of the males.

E. cardinalis lives in the group of Ceram (Ceram, Amboina, and Buru), *E. grandis* in the group of Gilolo, and, last, *E. polychlorus* in the Papuan Islands—from Waigiou to the Solomon Islands, and in the Kei Islands, which, according to my views, we must put with the Papuan Islands rather than with the Moluccas. All this I have already shown in the 3rd part (*Psittaci*) of my “*Prodromus Ornithologiæ Papuasæ et Moluccarum*” (Ann. Mus. Civ. Gen. x. p. 31), where, owing to an omission of the printer, “Ceram (*Von Rosenberg, Wallace*)” has been left out from the localities inhabited by *E. cardinalis*. The so-called *E. polychlorus*, from Ternate, Gilolo, Batchian, and Morotay, is the male of *E. grandis*. We have an evident proof of this in the fact that the so-called *E. linnæi*, which now we know is the female of *E. polychlorus*, is not to be found in the islands of the Gilolo group, but only in the truly Papuan Islands.

Turin, Zoological Museum, July 25th, 1877.

XLIII.—*Notices of recently published Ornithological Works.*

[Continued from p. 385.]

52. *Salvadori on the Papuan Parrots.*

[*Prodromus ornithologiæ Papuasæ et Moluccarum* auctore Thoma Salvadori. III. *Psittaci*. Ann. Mus. Civ. Genoa, x. p. 21.]

The third part of Salvadori's ‘*Prodromus*’ is devoted to the Parrots—a prominent group in Papua and the Moluccas—no less than 92 species being enumerated in the present list. D’Albertis, Beccari, and Bruijn have transmitted no less than 1363 specimens of this group to Genoa, referable to 69 species.

The following four new species are established :—*Geoffroyus keyensis*, ex inss. Key ; *G. schlegeli* (= *rhodops*, Schl., nec G. R. Gray) ; *Lorius erythrothorax*, ex Nov. Guin. merid.-orient. ; *L. flavo-palliatu*s ex Obi et Batchian : and two new genera, “*Oreopsittacus*” for *Trichoglossus arfaki*, Meyer ; and “*Charmosynopsis*” for *Charmosyna pulchella*, G. R. Gray.